



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/727,314 | 12/04/2003 | Wy Peron Lee | USP2266A-SMD | 6215 |
| 30265 | 7590 | 12/07/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| RAYMOND Y. CHAN | | | CHOI, STEPHEN | |
| 108 N. YNEZ AVE., SUITE 128 | | | ART UNIT | |
| MONTEREY PARK, CA 91754 | | | PAPER NUMBER | |

3724

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SP

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/727,314 | LEE, WY PERON | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Stephen Choi | 3724 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4,7-12,16 and 18-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,13-15 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly amended claims 21-28 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: Newly submitted claims 21-28 contain non-elected subject matter of the previous restriction requirement (see claim 24). The combination of claims 21 and 24 was not elected. Since applicants have already presented claims showing evidence that the subject matter of the newly submitted claims are patentably distinct from the subject matter of the elected invention, claims 21-28 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 21-28 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: "locking arms" should be --locker arms--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 3724

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cole (US 3,669,031) in view of Oltman et al. (US 4,239,195) and Braddock (US 5,578,953).

Regarding claim 1, Cole discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a docking station comprising a boundary frame having a docking socket (12, 14) and a peripheral functional gear (22) comprising a retractable utility table (at 22) slidably received in a side opening (at 24a and 24b). Cole fails to teach a locker device comprising a plurality of locking members and a plurality of resilient locker arms, and a utility tools box. Braddock discloses a locker device comprising a plurality of locking members (28) and a plurality of locker arms (26) for detachable locking a cutting machine. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a locker device as taught by Braddock on the device of Cole in order to detachably locking the cutting machine. Furthermore, Oltman discloses a utility tools box (30) mounted on a side of a workbench. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a utility tool box as taught by Oltman on the device of Cole in order to provide easy access for utility tools to an operator of the cutting machine. Regarding claim 2, at 25 and 30 of Cole. Regarding claim 3, see col. 3, lines 40-52 of Cole. Regarding claims 5-6, the modified device of Cole discloses a dolly frame (16) comprising two wheel assemblies (49) and a dolly handle (56).

Art Unit: 3724

5. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cole in view of Ransom (US 6,672,348) and Braddock.

Regarding claim 13, Cole discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for a cutting head having a cutting blade overhangingly supported above the cutting table and a locker device comprising a plurality of locking members and a plurality of locker arms. Ransom discloses a miter saw (26) mounted on a frame. Braddock discloses a locker device comprising a plurality of locking members (28) and a plurality of locker arms (26) for detachable locking a cutting machine. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a miter saw as taught by Ransom and a locker device as taught by Braddock on the device of Cole in order to detachably locking the miter saw to perform different cutting operation. Regarding claim 14, the modified device of Cole teaches a retractable utility table (at 22) slidably received in a side opening (at 24a and 24b).

6. Claims 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cole in view of Ransom and Braddock as applied to claims 13-14 above, and further in view of Oltman.

The modified device of Cole discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for a utility tools box. Oltman discloses a utility tools box (30) mounted on a side of a workbench. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a utility tool box as taught by Oltman on the modified device of Cole in order to provide easy access for utility tools to an operator of

the cutting machine. Regarding claim 17, the modified device of Cole discloses a dolly frame (16) comprising two wheel assemblies (49) and a dolly handle (56).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-6, 13-15, and 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Choi whose telephone number is 571-272-4504. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 571-272-4514. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

sc
5 December 2005


STEPHEN CHOI
PRIMARY EXAMINER